



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,179	03/30/2006	Toshihiro Iwakuma	287634US2PCT	4095
22850	7590	02/05/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			HANLEY, BRITT D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2889	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/574,179	IWAKUMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BRITT HANLEY	2889

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/30/2006, 11/09/2006, 01/04/2007, 05/27/2008,
10/20/2008.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

[01] The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

[02] The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

[03] Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant cited Tokito et al. (High-efficiency white phosphorescent organic light-emitting devices with greenish-blue and red-emitting layers).

[04] Regarding claim 1, Tokito et al. disclose an organic electroluminescent device comprising at least an anode (ITO, Figure 1), a first emitting layer ((CF₃ppy)₂Ir(pic):CDBP, Figure 1), a hole barrier layer (BAIq, Figure 1), a second emitting layer ((btp)₂Ir(acac):CDBP, Figure 1) and a cathode (LiF, Figure 1) in this order (Figure 1); wherein the first emitting layer and the second emitting layer both comprise a hole transporting material (CDBP).

[05] Regarding claim 2, Tokito et al. disclose the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 1, wherein the first emitting layer and the second emitting layer both have a hole mobility of 10-5 cm.sup.2/Vs or more (since Tokito et al. disclose the same materials for the emitting layers as the Applicant - see at least the first schematic structure under paragraph 48 and paragraph 54 of the PGPub - CDBP as a host

material and the same dopant - see paragraph 50 and 55 - the emitting layers of Tokito et al. will have the same material properties as claim above).

[06] Regarding claim 6, Tokito *et al.* disclose the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 1, wherein the first emitting layer is a blue emitting layer (see at least abstract and Figure 1).

[07] Regarding claim 7, Tokito *et al.* disclose the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 1, wherein the second emitting layer is a yellow-to-red emitting layer (see at least abstract and Figure 1).

[08] Regarding claim 10, Tokito *et al.* disclose the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 1 that emits white light (see abstract) and last paragraph of page 2461).

[09] Regarding claim 11, Tokito *et al.* disclose a display-comprising the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 1 (see first paragraph of page 2459).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

[10] The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

[11] The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

[12] Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant cited Tokito et al. (High-efficiency white phosphorescent organic light-emitting devices with greenish-blue and red-emitting layers).

[13] Regarding claims 8 and 9, Tokito *et al.* disclose the limitations of claim 1. Tokito *et al.* do not explicitly appear to disclose that the emitting layer next to the anode is a yellow-to-red emitter and the emitter next to the cathode is a blue emitting layer. Tokito *et al.* disclose that the blue emitting layer is next to the anode and that the yellow-to-red emitting layer is next to the cathode. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art having the reference of Tokito *et al.* to modify the location of the emitting layers as it is a matter of ordinary skill in the art. Further, since the hole blocking layer allows both emitting layers to emit independently, the device will function if the two emitting layers are rearranged.

[14] Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant cited Tokito et al. (High-efficiency white phosphorescent organic light-emitting devices with greenish-blue and red-emitting layers) in view of Zugang *et al.* (White organic light-emitting diodes emitting from both hole and electron transport layers).

[15] Regarding claim 3, Tokito *et al.* disclose the limitations of claim 1, and further that the hole barrier layer is made of BA1q (see Figure 1). Tokito *et al.* do not explicitly appear to disclose the ionization potential of the hole barrier layer is higher than the

ionization potential of the first emitting layer by 0.2 eV or more. Examiner has found various publications teaching that the ionization potential (I_p) of Balq is about 6.0 eV. The I_p of the first emitting layer is 5.9e eV, as cited by Applicant in Tables 1 and 2.

[16] In the same field of OLEDs, Zugang *et al.* disclose a first and second emitting layer separated by a hole blocking layer (Figure 1). The hole blocking layer is PBD and is used because it is a good hole blocking material that allows emission from both the first and second emitting layers (see section 3.5). Applicant lists the I_p of PBD in Tables 1 and 2 as 6.2 eV, more than 0.2 eV higher than the emitting layers.

[17] At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art having the references of Tokito *et al.* and Zugang *et al.* to modify the hole blocking material of Tokito *et al.* to include the hole blocking material of Zugang *et al.* in order to increase the hole blocking properties of the hold blocking layer (a high I_p results in better hole blocking characteristics).

[18] Regarding claim 4, Tokito *et al.* disclose the limitations of claim 1. Tokito *et al.* do not explicitly appear to disclose a difference in affinity level between the hole barrier layer and the first emitting layer is 0.2 eV or less. In the same field of OLEDs, Zugang *et al.* disclose a first and second emitting layer separated by a hole blocking layer (Figure 1). The hole blocking layer is PBD and is used because it is a good hole blocking material that allows emission from both the first and second emitting layers (see section 3.5). Since the resulting device will have the same materials for the emitting and hole blocking layers, the claimed material characterizes are obvious over the device. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art having the references of Tokito *et al.* and Zugang *et al.* to modify the hole blocking material of Tokito *et al.* to include the hole blocking material of Zugang *et al.* in order to increase the hole blocking properties of the hold blocking layer (a high I_p results in better hole blocking characteristics).

[19] Regarding claim 5, Tokito *et al.* disclose the limitations of claim 1. Tokito *et al.* do not explicitly appear to disclose a difference in affinity level between the hole barrier layer and the second emitting layer is 0.2 eV or less. In the same field of OLEDs, Zugang *et al.* disclose a first and second emitting layer separated by a hole blocking layer (Figure 1). The hole blocking layer is PBD and is used because it is a good hole blocking material that allows emission from both the first and second emitting layers (see section 3.5). Since the resulting device will have the same materials for the emitting and hole blocking layers, the claimed material characterizes are obvious over the device. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art having the references of Tokito *et al.* and Zugang *et al.* to modify the hole blocking material of Tokito *et al.* to include the hole blocking material of Zugang *et al.* in order to increase the hole blocking properties of the hold blocking layer (a high I_p results in better hole blocking characteristics).

Conclusion

[20] Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Britt Hanley whose telephone number is (571) 270-3042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30a-5:00p ET.

[21] If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minh-Toan Ton can be reached on (571)272-2303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

[22] Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Britt Hanley/ Examiner, Art Unit 2889	/Toan Ton/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2889
---	---